APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,404	11/22/2006	Damien Mandy	979-133	9106

39600   7590   06/12/2009
SOFER & HAROUN LLP.
317 MADISON AVENUE, SUITE 910
NEW YORK, NY 10017

EXAMINER
ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3628	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/12/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/531,404	MANDY, DAMIEN
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	AKIBA K. ROBINSON BOYCE	3628	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

    A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 February 2009</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1.   Due to communications filed 2/26/09, the following is a final office action. Claims

1-10 have been amended. Claims 11 and 12 have been added. Claims 1-12 are

pending in this application and have been examined on the merits. Claims 1-12 are

rejected as follows. The previous rejection has been adjusted to reflect claim

amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed
> or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the
> subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject
> matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was
> made.

3.   Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lee**

(KR 2001028721 A), and further in view of Silberberg (US 20030010821 A1), and

further in view of Amirpanahi (US 5,648,906).

        As per claims 1, 10, Silberberg discloses

        supplying to a user a code specific to a first payment corresponding to a first

authorized parking time, ([0059], payment can be made by any of the other methods

previously referred to including credit card payment in which credit card details are

transmitted either automatically from the mobile phone or by the user keying **numbers** into the mobile phone, or from a Smart Card or SIM Card associated with the telephone 60 and which carries a cash balance which is reduced in accordance with the cost of the parking, and once payment has been verified by the central station 50 the central station 50 transmits a code back to the telephone 60 which acts as a virtual receipt to indicate that parking has been paid for, where the code also acts as a code allowing entry into the parking station 100 when the user presents at the parking station 100); and

said user making a second payment corresponding to a second authorized parking time, ([0052], Silberberg discloses that the user can input a command by touching any key indicating that parking time should be extended and the central control station will deduct appropriate payment from the user's account and reactive the parking meter to show that additional parking time has been paid for);

Silberberg foes not specifically disclose when making said second payment, said user providing said code specific to said first payment so as to increase said second authorized parking time by may a residual authorized time corresponding to said first authorized parking time, however does disclose a payment option where the user uses his telephone number to dial the central station and the users account number is automatically deduced from the user's telephone number as shown in [0048].

However, Amirpanahi discloses in col. 12, lines 32-56 that upon reinsertion of the parking charge card into the magnetic strip reader the networked computerized parking

system credits the parking charge card with the unused amount of parking fee, and

identification information of the parking charge card is transferred to the central

database computer 90 upon insertion of the parking charge card into the card insertion

opening 68 so that any unused amount of parking fee is added back to the remaining,

unused value of the parking charge card, and the identification information is checked to

assure that any refund only goes back to the parking charge card originally entered into

the card insertion opening 68, i.e the code of the parking charge card entered for refund

matches with the code of the parking charge card originally entered for purchase of

parking time. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Silberberg and

Amirpanahi to disclose cooperating between said payment means and an appropriate

processing and input means whereby the user can enter the code of an earlier

transaction and thereby increase said authorized parking time by any residual

authorized time corresponding to the authorized time linked to said earlier

transaction/and wherein said payment means cooperates with appropriate processing

and input means whereby the user can enter the code of an earlier transaction and

thereby increase said authorized parking time by any remaining authorized time

corresponding to the authorized time linked to said earlier transaction.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to cooperate between said payment means and an appropriate

processing and input means whereby the user can enter the code of an earlier

transaction and thereby increase said authorized parking time by any residual

authorized time corresponding to the authorized time linked to said earlier transaction/

and wherein said payment means cooperates with appropriate processing and input

means whereby the user can enter the code of an earlier transaction and thereby

increase said authorized parking time by any remaining authorized time corresponding

to the authorized time linked to said earlier transaction with the motivation of showing

that a user's is capable of using residual time to extend parking time.

As per claim 2, Silberberg discloses:

wherein the parking space is identified by a number and the user provides said

number during said second payment operation using the appropriate input and

processing means cooperating with said payment means, (Silberberg discloses that the

user can input a command by touching any key indicating that parking time should be

extended and the central control station will deduct appropriate payment from the user's

account and reactive the parking meter to show that additional parking time has been

paid for in [0052], where a unique code printed on the parking meter and is inputted into

the user's telephone to relay that data to the central station as shown in [0047])

As per claim 3, Silberberg discloses:

wherein said parking space number is used to generate said specific code

specific to said first payment, (Silberberg discloses a payment option where the user

uses his telephone number to dial the central station and the users account number is

automatically deduced from the user's telephone number as shown in [0048]).

.

As per claim 4, Silberberg foes not specifically disclose wherein said second authorized parking time is increased by any residual time only if said first payment relates to said parking space, however does disclose in [0052], that the user can input a command by touching any key indicating that parking time should be extended and the central control station will deduct appropriate payment from the user's account and reactive the parking meter to show that additional parking time has been paid for.

However, Amirpanahi discloses in col. 12, lines 32-56 that upon reinsertion of the parking charge card into the magnetic strip reader the networked computerized parking system credits the parking charge card with the unused amount of parking fee, and identification information of the parking charge card is transferred to the central database computer 90 upon insertion of the parking charge card into the card insertion opening 68 so that any unused amount of parking fee is added back to the remaining, unused value of the parking charge card, and the identification information is checked to assure that any refund only goes back to the parking charge card originally entered into the card insertion opening 68, i.e the code of the parking charge card entered for refund matches with the code of the parking charge card originally entered for purchase of parking time. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Silberberg and Amirpanahi to disclose wherein said second authorized parking time is increased by any residual time only if said first payment relates to said parking space.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for said second authorized parking time to be increased by any residual time only if said first payment relates to said parking space with the motivation of showing that a user's is capable of using residual time to extend parking time.

As per claims 5, 6, 8 and 9, Silberberg foes not specifically disclose wherein said first authorized parking time is increased by any residual time only if said first payment relates to said parking space corresponding to a given amount paid by a user is equal to the greater of the following times: the time directly related to said payment, as defined in particular by an appropriate table of charges, and *any remaining authorized time corresponding to the previous authorized time relating to said parking space/* wherein the authorized time is equal to the greater of the following times: the time directly related to said first payment as defined by a table of charges and *any remaining authorized times corresponding to preceding authorized times relating to said parking space/* wherein said second authorized parking time after the user enters said code is equal to the greater of the following times: the time directly related to said payment, as defined in particular by a table of charges, plus any remaining authorized time corresponding to the authorized time linked to said first payment, and any remaining authorized time corresponding to the previous authorized time relating to said parking space of a transaction preceding said first payment/wherein said second authorized parking time after the user enters said code is equal to the greater of the following times: the time directly related to said payment, as defined in particular by a table of charges, plus any

remaining authorized time corresponding to said first authorized parking time , and any

remaining authorized times corresponding to previous authorized times relating to said

parking space of transactions preceding said first payment, however does disclose in

[0052], that the user can input a command by touching any key indicating that parking

time should be extended and the central control station will deduct appropriate payment

from the user's account and reactive the parking meter to show that additional parking

time has been paid for.

　　　　However, Amirpanahi discloses in col. 12, lines 32-56 that upon reinsertion of the

parking charge card into the magnetic strip reader the networked computerized parking

system credits the parking charge card with the unused amount of parking fee, and

identification information of the parking charge card is transferred to the central

database computer 90 upon insertion of the parking charge card into the card insertion

opening 68 so that any unused amount of parking fee is added back to the remaining,

unused value of the parking charge card, and the identification information is checked to

assure that any refund only goes back to the parking charge card originally entered into

the card insertion opening 68, i.e the code of the parking charge card entered for refund

matches with the code of the parking charge card originally entered for purchase of

parking time. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Silberberg and

Amirpanahi to disclose wherein said first authorized parking time is increased by any

residual time only if said first payment relates to said parking space corresponding to a

given amount paid by a user is equal to the greater of the following times: the time

directly related to said payment, as defined in particular by an appropriate table of

charges, and *any remaining authorized time corresponding to the previous authorized time relating to said parking space/* wherein the authorized time is equal to the greater of the following times: the time directly related to said first payment as defined by a table of charges and *any remaining authorized times corresponding to preceding authorized times relating to said parking space/* wherein said second authorized parking time after the user enters said code is equal to the greater of the following times: the time directly related to said payment, as defined in particular by a table of charges, plus any remaining authorized time corresponding to the authorized time linked to said first payment, and any remaining authorized time corresponding to the previous authorized time relating to said parking space of a transaction preceding said first payment/wherein said second authorized parking time after the user enters said code is equal to the greater of the following times: the time directly related to said payment, as defined in particular by a table of charges, plus any remaining authorized time corresponding to said first authorized parking time , and any remaining authorized times corresponding to previous authorized times relating to said parking space of transactions preceding said first payment.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for wherein said first authorized parking time is increased by any residual time only if said first payment relates to said parking space corresponding to a given amount paid by a user is equal to the greater of the following times: the time directly related to said payment, as defined in particular by an appropriate table of charges, and *any remaining authorized time corresponding to the previous authorized*

time relating to said parking space/ wherein the authorized time is equal to the greater

of the following times: the time directly related to said first payment as defined by a table

of charges and *any remaining authorized times corresponding to preceding authorized*

times relating to said parking space/ wherein said second authorized parking time after

the user enters said code is equal to the greater of the following times: the time directly

related to said payment, as defined in particular by a table of charges, plus any

remaining authorized time corresponding to the authorized time linked to said first

payment, and any remaining authorized time corresponding to the previous authorized

time relating to said parking space of a transaction preceding said first payment/wherein

said second authorized parking time after the user enters said code is equal to the

greater of the following times: the time directly related to said payment, as defined in

particular by a table of charges, plus any remaining authorized time corresponding to

said first authorized parking time , and any remaining authorized times corresponding to

previous authorized times relating to said parking space of transactions preceding said

first payment with the motivation of showing that a user's is capable of using residual

time to extend parking time.

As per claim 7, Silberberg discloses:

only the time directly related to said first payment as defined in particular by said

table of charges is communicated to the user, (Silberberg shows that a central controller

can telephone the user's mobile telephone and display a message indicating that

parking time is almost expired and asking for acknowledgment as to whether the meter

should be topped up for a further payment period up to one hour which will be the
maximum parking time allowed at that meter in [0027]).

As per claims 11, 12, Silberberg does not specifically disclose wherein said user
makes said second payment before an expiry of time of said first authorized parking
time, and wherein the residual authorized parking time corresponds to the time between
the second payment and the expiry time of the first authorized parking time/ wherein the
code of said first payment is valid until an expiry of time of said first
authorized parking time, and wherein the residual authorized parking time corresponds
to the time between said second payment and the expiry time of said first authorized
parking time , however does disclose the user will be presented with a display indicating
that parking time has almost expired and asked whether the user wishes to extend
parking time should that be possible. The user can input a command by touching any
key indicating that parking time should be extended and the central control station will
deduct appropriate payment from the user's account and reactive the parking meter to
show that additional parking time has been paid for in [0052].

However, Amirpanahi discloses in col. 11, lines 30-42 that information about an
amount deposited and **expiration** time is stored in the mother board 12. After checking
balance of the prepaid parking card and checking a card identifying code entered by the
user, the mother board 12 determines whether the pointer 59 of the timer 6 should be
moved to indicate amount of parking time desired to be purchased by the user, and also
in col. 12, lines 32-56 shows that any unused amount of parking fee is added back to

the remaining, unused value of the parking charge card. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Silberberg and Amirpanahi to disclose the following:

wherein said user makes said second payment before an expiry of time of said first authorized parking time, and wherein the residual authorized parking time corresponds to the time between the second payment and the expiry time of the first authorized parking time/ wherein said user makes said second payment before an expiry of time of said first authorized parking time, and wherein the residual authorized parking time corresponds to the time between the second payment and the expiry time of the first authorized parking time/ wherein the code of said first payment is valid until an expiry of time of said first authorized parking time, and wherein the residual authorized parking time corresponds to the time between said second payment and the expiry time of said first authorized parking time.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose the above limitations with the motivation of showing that a user can extend his parking time prior to the original parking time expiring.

Conclusion

4.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE
MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within
TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not
mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the
shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any
extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of
the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later
than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Akiba K Robinson-Boyce whose telephone number is
571-272-6734. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone number for
the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.
Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
•Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system, Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status
information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For
more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you
have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business
Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-

3900.

A. R. B.
June 12, 2009

/Akiba K Robinson-Boyce/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3628